



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,745	09/01/2000	David M. Orlicki	79594PRC	7150

1333 7590 12/08/2006

PATENT LEGAL STAFF  
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY  
343 STATE STREET  
ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

JERABEK, KELLY L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 09/654,745	Applicant(s) ORLICKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Kelly L. Jerabek	Art Unit 2622	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 20 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 20 November 2006. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: 8-11.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 12-24.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1) Applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 (After final amendment page 3) state that the network interface (142) as shown in figure 3 of Tanaka is not a docking interface of the type recited in the claim because there is no docking of the accessory devices (14,16) with the reception terminal station (18) in the Tanaka reference. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Tanaka states that a basic device (video reception terminal stations 18) are connected to a network (10) via a docking interface (142) and accessory devices (14,16) are connected to the network (10) via docking interface (42) of terminal stations (12) (col. 4, line 9-col. 6, line 14). Tanaka further states that each basic device (video reception terminal station 18) can control various parameters of an accessory device (16) via the corresponding video transmission terminal station (12) and camera control device (14) (col. 4, lines 45-51). Therefore, since docking interfaces (142, 42) provide a connection between the basic device (18) and the accessory device (16) the accessory device (16) couples to the docking interface (142) of the basic device (18) via the docking interface (42) of the terminal station (12) and the network (10).

2) Applicant's arguments regarding claim claim 1 (After final amendment page 4) state that the Tanaka reference fails to show that the control signal that controls the power supply of the accessory device is indicative of whether or not an application which requires use of the accessory device is currently running on the basic device. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Tanaka states that a camera power button (70) of a basic device (terminal station 18) is pressed in order to turn an accessory device (camera 16) on or off (col. 6, line 60-col. 7, line 20); col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23). Therefore, it can be seen that when the camera button (70) is pressed in order to turn a camera (16) an application which requires the use of the accessory device (camera 16) is running on the basic device. Thus, when the camera power button (70) is pressed in order to power on a camera on, a signal indicating that an application requiring the use of the accessory device (16) is currently running on the basic device (18) is sent.

3) Applicant's arguments regarding claim 1 (After final amendment page 4) state that the Tanaka reference fails to provide the automatic power conservation advantages that are provided in claim 1. However, claim 1 does not mention any automatic power conservation advantages. Therefore, the argument is moot.

4) Applicant's arguments regarding claim 21 (After final amendment pages 4-5) state that since it is the camera control server (56) that controls the "override shut-off" operation the Tanaka reference fails to teach or suggest the claimed step of generating a second control signal with a control processor of an accessory device. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Tanaka discloses an override shut-off that prevents the power down operation of a camera (16) if an image from the camera (16) is currently being transmitted to another terminal station (18) (col. 11, line 55-col. 13, line 4). Although this override shut-off operation is controlled by a camera control server (56) that is an element of the video transmission terminal station (12) it is clear that in order for the camera control server (56) to be able to identify that the camera (16) is currently transmitting an image, the camera must send a signal (second control signal) to the camera control server (56) indicating that an image is currently being transmitted to another terminal (18). Therefore, the Tanaka reference meets all of the limitations of claim 21.

5) Applicant's arguments regarding claim 13 (After final amendment page 5) state that the network interface disclosed by the Tanaka reference does not anticipate the recited docking interface for the same reasons provided above regarding claim 1. Therefore, the response to claim 1 above also applies here. Additionally, Applicant's arguments state that in claim 13, the recited docking interface is an element of the digital camera accessory device and not of the basic device. Therefore, network interface (142) does not constitute the docking interface as claimed. The Examiner agrees that the network interface (142) is the interface for the basic device. However, the accessory device (16) includes an interface (34) for connecting it to video transmission terminal station (12) and video transmission terminal station (12) includes an interface (42) for connecting it to the basic device (video reception terminal station 18). Since the basic device (video reception terminal station) is capable of communicating with and controlling the accessory device (camera 16) it can be seen that all of the interfaces (34,42, 142) are docking interfaces.

KLJ 12/5/06